

October 17, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H13521

The question is on the amendment.  
The amendment was agreed to.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 324, nays 44, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]  
YEAS—324

Abbott	Donohue	Kee
Abernethy	Dorn	Keith
Adair	Dowdy	Kelly
Adams	Downing	King, Calif.
Addabbo	Dulski	King, N.Y.
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan	Kirwan
Anderson,	Dwyer	Kleppe
Tenn.	Eckhardt	Kornegay
Andrews, Ala.	Edmondson	Kupferman
Andrews,	Edwards, Ala.	Kuykendall
N. Dak.	Edwards, La.	Kyros
Annunzio	Ellberg	Leggett
Arends	Esch	Lennon
Ashbrook	Eshleman	Lipscomb
Ashmore	Farbstein	Lloyd
Ayres	Feighan	Long, La.
Baring	Fino	Long, Md.
Barrett	Flood	Lukens
Bates	Flynt	McCarthy
Battin	Ford, Gerald R.	McClure
Belcher	Ford,	McCulloch
Bell	William D.	McDade
Bennett	Fraser	McDonald,
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Mich.
Betts	Friedel	McEwen
Blester	Fulton, Pa.	Macdonald,
Blackburn	Fuqua	Mass.
Blanton	Gallianakis	MacGregor
Blatnik	Gallagher	Machen
Boland	Gardner	Mailliard
Bow	Garmatz	Marsh
Brasco	Gathings	Martin
Brotzman	Gettys	Mathias, Calif.
Brown, Calif.	Gialmo	Mathias, Md.
Brown, Mich.	Gibbons	Matsunaga
Brown, Ohio	Gilbert	Meeds
Broyhill, N.C.	Gonzalez	Meskill
Broyhill, Va.	Goodling	Michel
Buchanan	Gray	Miller, Calif.
Burke, Fla.	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Ohio
Burke, Mass.	Green, Pa.	Mills
Burton, Calif.	Griffiths	Minish
Burton, Utah	Gross	Mink
Bush	Grover	Minshall
Byrnes, Wis.	Gubser	Mize
Cahill	Gurney	Monagan
Carey	Hagan	Moore
Carter	Haley	Morgan
Casey	Hall	Morris, N. Mex.
Cederberg	Halleck	Morse, Mass.
Celler	Halpern	Morton
Chamberlain	Hammer	Mosher
Clancy	Schmidt	Murphy, Ill.
Clark	Hanley	Murphy, N.Y.
Clausen,	Hanna	Myers
Don H.	Hansen, Idaho	Natcher
Clawson, Del.	Hansen, Wash.	Nelsen
Cleveland	Harrison	Nichols
Cohelan	Harsha	O'Hara, Ill.
Collier	Harvey	O'Hara, Mich.
Colmer	Hathaway	O'Konski
Conable	Hawkins	O'Neal, Ga.
Conte	Heckler, Mass.	O'Neill, Mass.
Corbett	Helstoski	Ottlinger
Corman	Henderson	Pasman
Cowder	Hicks	Patten
Cunningham	Horton	Pelly
Curtis	Hosmer	Pepper
Daddario	Howard	Perkins
Daniels	Hull	Pettis
Davis, Ga.	Hungate	Philbin
Davis, Wis.	Hunt	Pike
de la Garza	Hutchinson	Pirnie
Delaney	Ichord	Poage
Denney	Joelson	Poff
Dent	Johnson, Calif.	Pollock
Derwinski	Johnson, Pa.	Pool
Devine	Jones, Ala.	Price, Ill.
Dickinson	Jones, N.C.	Price, Tex.
Dingell	Karsten	Pryor
Dole	Karth	Pucinski

Quie	Schneebell	Tuck
Quillen	Schweiker	Ullman
Railsback	Schwengel	Van Deerlin
Randall	Scott	Vander Jagt
Reid, Ill.	Selden	Waggonner
Reifel	Shibley	Waldie
Reinecke	Shriver	Walker
Rhodes, Ariz.	Sisk	Wampler
Rhodes, Pa.	Skubitz	Watkins
Riegle	Slack	Watson
Rivers	Smith, Calif.	Watts
Robison	Smith, N.Y.	Whalen
Rodino	Smith, Okla.	Whalley
Rogers, Colo.	Springer	Whitener
Ronan	Stafford	Widnall
Rooney, N.Y.	Staggers	Wiggins
Rooney, Pa.	Stanton	Williams, Pa.
Rosenthal	Stelger, Ariz.	Wilson,
Rostenkowski	Stelger, Wis.	Charles H.
Roth	Stubblefield	Winn
Roudebush	Sullivan	Wolf
Roybal	Taft	Wright
Ruppe	Talcott	Wyatt
Ryan	Taylor	Wydler
Sandman	Teague, Calif.	Wylie
Satterfield	Tenzer	Wyman
St Germain	Thompson, Ga.	Zablocki
Saylor	Thompson, N.J.	Zion
Schadeberg	Thomson, Wis.	Zwach
Scherle	Tiernan	

NAYS—44

Ashley	Hechler, W. Va.	Roberts
Bevill	Hollfield	Rogers, Fla.
Bingham	Jacobs	Roush
Bolling	Jarman	Rumsfeld
Brademas	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Esch	Kyl	Sikes
Brooks	Langen	Smith, Iowa
Burleson	McClory	Steed
Cabell	McFall	Stratton
Conyers	Mayne	Stuckey
Dow	Montgomery	Vanik
Fascell	Moss	White
Fisher	Nedzi	Whitten
Hamilton	Pickle	Yates
Hardy	Reuss	

NOT VOTING—64

Albert	Fountain	Nix
Aspinall	Fulton, Tenn.	Olsen
Boggs	Goodell	Patman
Bolton	Gude	Purcell
Bray	Hays	Rarick
Brook	Hébert	Rees
Broomfield	Herlong	Reld, N.Y.
Button	Holland	Resnick
Byrne, Pa.	Irwin	St. Onge
Cramer	Jonas	Snyder
Culver	Jones, Mo.	Stephens
Dawson	Kazen	Teague, Tex.
Dellenback	Kluczynski	Tunney
Diggs	Laird	Udall
Edwards, Calif.	Landrum	Utt
Erlenborn	Latta	Vigorito
Evans, Colo.	McMillan	Williams, Miss.
Everett	Madden	Willis
Evins, Tenn.	Mahon	Wilson, Bob
Fallon	May	Young
Findley	Moorhead	
Foley	Multer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Foley with Mr. Jonas.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Findley.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Utt.  
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Goodell.  
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Reid of New York.  
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Brook.  
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Snyder.  
Mr. Tunney with Mrs. Bolton.  
Mr. Everett with Mr. Erlenborn.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Laird.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Latta.  
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Dellenback.  
Mr. Herlong with Mrs. May.  
Mr. Multer with Mr. Gude.  
Mr. Albert with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Button.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Landrum.  
Mr. Madden with Mr. McMillan.  
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Dawson.  
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Hays.  
Mr. Nix with Mr. Udall.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Mahon with Mr. Willis.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Vigorito.  
Mr. Young with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rarick.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Rees.

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND  
REMARKS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 159.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES WILL KEEP  
ITS WORD

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, some of our critics, domestic and foreign, have said that our efforts to help South Vietnam resist Communist aggression amount to reckless intervention which constitutes a threat to world peace. They say that we are fighting the specter of monolithic communism which no longer exists in the polycentric Communist world.

I would ask these critics two questions: First, who undertook as far back as 1959, long before we had combat troops in Vietnam, to attempt through subversion and terror to seize control of South Vietnam? Who has infiltrated men and equipment, as we spelled out in a white paper on Vietnam released in December 1961? I suggest the reckless intervention has come from Hanoi and history and the facts bear this out.

The second question I would ask the critics is: Are we to ignore the solemn commitments given to the South Vietnamese people—commitments made by four successive American Presidents of both political parties? The whole system of international security built up in the postwar period rests on the trust and faith that America does honor its commitments, that America does keep its word, that America does not and will not acquiesce to Communist aggression or wars of national liberation. If we were to pull out of Vietnam, leaving the 17 million Vietnamese people to Communist domination, the implications for our overall foreign policy and worldwide position would be immediate and catastrophic. Can a system built on trust and faith endure when this trust and faith are breached? But we will not unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam, we will not break our word, we will not abandon the Vietnamese to Hanoi's domination.

Our Government, other governments, world leaders such as His Holiness the Pope, have undertaken countless initiatives trying to bring this conflict to a peaceful and honorable settlement. The answer of Hanoi to all these efforts, all these proposals, has been a flat "No." One can only conclude that Hanoi does not want peace except on its own terms. And while these efforts to get negotiations continue, we have no option but to respond to the continuing military and terrorist pressures of the Vietcong and Hanoi. Progress has been made, the Communist military buildup has been blunted, and Hanoi is paying a high price for its aggression.

#### ABM SYSTEM SEEN OUTDATED

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Billy Mitchell was right. I keep his picture in my office in the Rayburn Building as a constant reminder that our leaders were wrong—military and political leaders.

If the Western World leaders and the Congress had listened to Billy Mitchell, there would have been no Pearl Harbor and, I believe, no World War II with 25 million dead.

I greatly fear that a thin ABM system around the United States will lull us into a feeling of false security.

I believe we could provide more security for our people by spending these vast billions on a future offense system and thus prevent world war III altogether.

The following article appeared in the Columbia State on October 9:

#### ABM SYSTEM SEEN OUTDATED

NEW YORK.—Pressure from Congress and the joint chiefs of staff for a heavy anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system oriented to defense against Soviet attack reflects an old military weakness: preparing to fight the previous war.

Technology has overtaken the ABM. The United States already has developed an effective antidote to it—sophisticated multiple warheads for the new offensive missiles, Minuteman III and Poseidon, which are to be ready in the early 1970's. Official estimates indicate that the Soviet Union can do the same in five to seven years.

Whatever the case for a "light" ABM defense against primitive Chinese missiles, arguments for either superpower to build a \$40 billion missile defense to protect its cities against the other are now as outdated as the Billy Mitchell bomber-vs-battleship controversy.

A hitherto-secret four-letter acronym, MIRV—multiple independent re-entry vehicles, and the key word is "independent"—describes an advance in nuclear weaponry that will enable the offense to penetrate any defense now foreseeable.

"Both our missile defense system and (Russia's) were designed before MIRV's came along as a serious possibility," Secretary McNamara has acknowledged.

One MIRV missile will be able to carry ten or more hydrogen warheads that can separate in flight, change trajectory several times and fly independently to ten or more pre-selected targets. Equipped with MIRV, America's 1,700 strategic missiles could carry 17,000 or more separately targetable warheads, dwarfing the widely discussed Soviet increase this past year from 300 to about 450 single-

warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's).

Early in the ABM debate, Secretary McNamara predicted that the Soviet Union and the U.S. each would respond to the other's ABM installations by improving offensive capabilities. "All we would accomplish," the defense secretary said, "would be to increase greatly both their defense expenditures and ours without any gain in real security to either side."

#### THE AMERICAN FARMER HAS BEEN SERIOUSLY AFFECTED BY THE BIGNESS SYNDROME

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact of American life that we think and talk in terms of millions and billions. Whether it is dollars or people we are referring to, we accentuate the mass and generally ignore the few.

The American farmer has been seriously affected by the bigness syndrome. He has been described as the "forgotten American" and is said to be suffering from a Federal agriculture policy that lacks realism.

I have recently received a letter from a constituent who puts forth a lucid argument on behalf of a rational U.S. farm policy. He gives examples of the ill-timed directives of the Department of Agriculture—directives which have forced many of our finest Americans to literally fight for their existence as farm producers.

Under unanimous consent I include the letter in full in the Record:

AUGUST 28, 1967.

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: The U.S. farmer finds himself in the middle of continuous higher production costs and declining grain prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture asked and encouraged expansion of our 1967 major grain crop acreages.

He insisted on a billion bushel soybean crop, to which the farmers responded. Present estimates of this year's crop is 999 million bushels, yet we failed to find markets for 100 million bushels of the 1966 crop. If we do not find export markets for more soybeans in 1967 than we did in 1966 we will at the end of the 1967 year be faced with a 275 to 300 million bushel carryover. To provide markets for a billion bushel crop it is necessary to find export markets for fifty percent of this production.

Recently we have been exporting about 20% of our corn production. The Secretary asked for more 1967 corn acreage by reducing the amount of corn acreage that could be diverted, and yet at the same time we exported less of our 1966 crop than we did of the 1965 crop. We are now faced with a 4.7 billion bushel corn crop, the largest ever, and less prospects for foreign markets.

Troublesome wheat surpluses had at the end of 1965 disappeared. The Secretary permitted a 32% increase in wheat acreage allotments, so that before next year's crop is harvested we are going to have a 600 million bushel carryover, or almost a half a crop. Wheat today at the local elevator is selling for \$1.28 per bushel.

It is apparent that a year ago our National Administration was dedicated to the cause

of feeding the world, and to cheap domestic food prices. The farmers responded to the Secretary's request for greater food production, and now we find ourselves faced with insufficient markets and in most part ruinous prices.

During 1966 it appeared that we had eliminated troublesome surpluses, and that agriculture was going to come into its own. Now, due to a reversal in national policy on feeding the world, being dealt short in the Common Market, and an earlier attitude of cheap domestic food prices, we suddenly find ourselves again with burdensome surpluses.

I can appreciate that all this misplanning cannot be corrected immediately, but most certainly it should have careful and quick consideration to relieve the farmer from the situation he was led into.

There are two items that warrant immediate attention—

(1) The U.S. farmer will be dealt another blow in October, when in all probability levies on our grains in the Common Market will be increased \$9 per ton.

(2) Beef production was the first of our major agricultural enterprises to emerge in a strong position. Twice during the past three years, however, when beef prices attained satisfactory levels the import quotas of New Zealand, Australia, and South America were used to obtain cheaper domestic prices. Beef cattle prices are now in a satisfactory position, but the unlimited usage of these one year quotas in a given period did, and again can break the market. These quotas should be on a monthly basis, so that they cannot be used to the end of breaking the market. There is also some question as to whether or not these yearly quotas as provided are too high.

I trust that you will be able to give study and support to the problems of agriculture as thus stated.

Sincerely yours,

#### HISTORIC ADDRESS HONORING PAUL AND EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point to comment on an evening with Paul and Emily Taft Douglas on September 28, 1967, when Senator and Mrs. Douglas were honored by the board of governors of Illinois State colleges and universities and the administration and faculty of the Chicago State College for their distinguished joint contributions to the academic community and to include the full text of the introduction of Senator Douglas, Chairman of the National Commission on Urban Problems, by Dr. Milton Byrd, president of Chicago State College; the response thereto by the Honorable Paul A. Douglas, and the resolutions of the board of governors of Illinois State colleges and universities honoring Paul Douglas and Emily Taft Douglas.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to give to my colleagues and the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a full accounting of the historic events and addresses honoring the Honorable Paul H. Douglas and his wife, the Honorable Emily Taft Douglas, in connection with the inauguration of Dr. Milton B. Byrd as president of Chicago State College at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago on Sep-